

## SUMMARY OF SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

**DATE:** April 30, 2003

**TO:** Ross Dunfee, Steering Committee Chairman  
Karen Dinicola, Department of Ecology

**COPY:** Stormwater Manual Subcommittee Members and Consultant Team

**FROM:** Dave Moss, Tt/KCM

**SUBJECT:** **Summary of Stormwater Manual Subcommittee Meeting**  
**Moses Lake Conference Center**  
**April 17, 2003 8:30 am – 4:00 pm**

**PROJECT:** EASTERN WASHINGTON STORMWATER MANAGEMENT  
Stormwater Management Technical Manual *and*  
Model Municipal NPDES Phase II Stormwater Program

### Subcommittee Meeting Attendees:

Ross Dunfee – Benton County	Karen Dinicola – Ecology
Steve Worley – Spokane County	Bill Moore – Ecology
Nancy Aldrich – City of Richland	Mike Hepp – Ecology
Gary Nelson – Spokane County	Dave Moss – TetraTech
John Hohman – Spokane County	Tony Righellis – HHR
Colleen Little – Spokane County	Heather Ostenson – RH2
Paula Cox – Chelan County	Dave Kliewer – JUB
Steve King – City of Wenatchee	Jocelyne Gray – JUB
Dick Thiel – City of Spokane Valley	Michele Brich – HBA of Tri-Cities
Lloyd Brewer – City of Spokane	Brad Bogus – Kennedy-Jenks / Pasco
Steve Hansen – City of Spokane	Nelson Ogren – Mountain Crest Enterprises
Don Gatchalian – Yakima County	Gary Beeman – WSDOT
John Knutson – Yakima County	John Heinley – WSDOT

### PURPOSE OF MEETING:

This meeting was held to gather the Manual subcommittee and at-large members to continue review of public comments and prepare responses for updating the project documents.

### AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING:

1. Introductions; Sign-in; Review/Confirm Agenda for Today's Meeting

2. Review subcommittee meeting summary for March 13th
3. Hydrologic Issues – Tony Righellis (HHR) – Presentation and Discussion
4. Design Storms / Snowmelt – Review comments and draft responses (not completed; finish on May 1st)
5. Core Element #5 – Review revised text for Chapter 2 (comment responses to be finished on May 1st)
6. Working lunch
7. Chapter 4 – Review comments and draft responses
8. Core Element #6 – Review revised text for Chapter 2 (comment responses to be finished on May 1st)
9. Chapter 6 – Finish reviewing comments and draft responses (time not available; finish on May 1st)
10. Next meeting: date, time and agenda

## **BRIEF SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS:**

1. Steve Worley opened the meeting, and facilitated introductions; sign-in; confirmed agenda as proposed.
2. Steve Worley reviewed the summary of the March 13, 2003 meeting, and asked if there were any comments or corrections. Steve noted the summary should refer to minutes of the February 13, 2003 meeting under the “Brief Summary of Proceedings.”
3. Tony Righellis (HHR of Las Vegas, NV) discussed his draft white paper and gave his second presentation on design storm hydrology and modeling methodologies. This is a special task to assist with updating Chapter 4 of the manual. [Tony’s draft white paper and powerpoint presentation are ~~included as~~ separate documents.] To summarize Tony’s analysis would involve listing most everything in his documents, so it’s not repeated here. Briefly, however, Tony reviewed his presentation of March 13th and again suggested that the long duration storm could be represented by the SCS Type IA hyetograph, with correction for antecedent moisture under certain conditions. The 24-hour duration seemed appropriate for Regions 2, 3 and 4, but a multiplier might be appropriate for Region 1 where rainfall is typically longer. Tony noted the “second hump” of the custom regional storms developed by Mel Schaefer (MGS) could also be implemented using the current SCS methodology. In summary, the Subcommittee agreed to include four design storms in Chapter 4. They are: the SCS Type II storm; a Short Duration storm, being MGS’s custom 3-hour storm; and two storms for Long Duration – the SCS Type IA storm, and MGS’s “second hump” storm (to be called the “Regional Storm”).
4. Steve Worley then facilitated the process of going through comments and draft responses for the selected sections of the Manual, including: Core Elements #5 and #6 for Chapter 2; Snowmelt and Design Storms comments for CE#5 and CE#6; and Chapter 4. [Prior to the meeting, a copy of all the comments and proposed draft responses (and text revisions for CE#5 and CE#6) were sent to the subcommittee members.] In today’s meeting, the Manual subcommittee then reviewed each comment and each response and either agreed or edited the response. A few responses were deferred to later meetings when related discussion was scheduled to take place. The details of all the discussion are captured in the updated version of each section, distributed separately. The draft responses were formatted as follows:

*COMMENT NOTED: means the comment has been taken into consideration but generally no change to the document is suggested at this time*

*RESPONSE: the change suggested in the comment is either accepted or rejected as described*

*SUGGESTED RESPONSE: followed by a draft response to be considered by the subcommittee*

*SUBCOMMITTEE TO DISCUSS: the comment should be addressed, but a suggested change may or may not be proposed yet – requires discussion by the subcommittee [which was done in the meeting].*

Again, the detailed discussion is not summarize herewith, but rather in the Comments/Responses document to be sent separately to each subcommittee member (and posted on the FTP site).

5. To supplement the discussion on Core Element #6, Michele Brich handed out a letter her office had received from Chandler Morse of the National Association of Home Builders regarding his review of the white paper entitled “A Scientific Basis for Requiring Flow Control to Protect Eastern Washington Streams” prepared and presented last meeting by Mike Brunfelt of Inter-Fluve. Mr. Morse noted “the report does provide brief background information relating the influence of imperviousness and stream condition. It does not, however, support the recommended imperviousness threshold nor does it provide a valid rationalization for the appropriateness of using such a threshold. In addition, the report fails to provide much in the way of a usable recommendation for selecting a design storm for use in implementing a flow control standard.”
6. To supplement the discussion on Chapter 4, Spokane County handed out a proposed draft text for Section 4.8 on New Design Approaches. This document suggested a process that Ecology might use to review and approve new and alternate approaches to stormwater design and management for incorporation into future updates to the manual, or in “equivalent” manuals. Also during the discussion for Chapter 4, the Subcommittee agreed that local jurisdictions should decide whether or not to include snowmelt in the runoff calculations. Guidance would be provided in the Manual as a place to start.
7. The text revisions for Core Element #5 and Core Element #6 were reviewed and edited. Review of comments and draft responses for these same two Core Elements began during the meeting, but was not completed. Completion of review and discussion for CE#5 and CE#6 was rescheduled for the next meeting.
8. A special meeting (to “catch up”) was scheduled for May 1st, one week ahead of the previously scheduled meeting for May 8. The next meeting’s agenda (as listed below) was prepared. Meeting adjourned at 4pm.

### **PRELIMINARY AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING:**

The **next meeting** will be at the Moses Lake Conference Center on **May 1, 2003**, from **9:00am to 3pm**. The agenda will include:

- Review of Subcommittee agenda and summary from April 17, 2003 meeting.
- Review/discuss comments and draft responses on the following sections:
  - > Core Element #5 – Chapter 2 (cont’d from April 17 meeting) <
  - > Core Element #6 – Chapter 2 (cont’d from April 17 meeting) <
  - > Design Storms / Snowmelt – portion of Core Elements #5 & #6 – Chapter 2 <
  - > Chapter 6 – Water Quality Facility Design (cont’d from March 13 meeting) <
  - > Section 6.2.3 – Cold Weather Considerations (updated since March 13 meeting) <
  - > Core Element #4 – Chapter 2 (updated version) <
- Preliminary discussion and sign-ups for the June 2003 public workshops
- Other discussion pertinent to making Manual ready for a second public review.

*The following notes are from the flip charts (created at the meeting) from participant comments:*

No flip charts were created.